DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 274 RC 011 887

TITLE	Trends in Segregation of Hispanic Students in Major School Districts Having Large Hispanic Enrollment. Sample III, Volume IV. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Aspira, Inc., New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	30 Nov 79
GRANT	NIE-G-780226
NOTE	10p.: For related documents, see RC 011 883-886 and RC 011 888.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Blacks; *Desegregation Methods; Elementary Secondary Education; *Enrollment Trends; Equal Education; *Hispanic Americans; *Integration Studies; Mobility; Public Schools; School Desegregation; *School Districts
IDENTIFIERS	*United States (Southwest)

ABSTRACT

A purposive sample of 20 school districts in 10 states was analyzed to determine patterns of change in segregation indices during 1968-1976 for blacks and Hispanics and to determine the extent to which segregation was attributable to mobility. No overall pattern could accurately describe school desegregation at the district level for Hispanics. Such desegregation was sometimes the result of further segregation of racial groups within the district and at other times was simply the result of "white flight". Although black segregation was higher than Hispanic segregation in nearly every district analyzed, black segregation decreased significantly more than Hispanic segregation during the eight years covered by the study. In tri-ethnic communities Hispanic segregation remained nearly static overall. Hispanics were differentially affected by desegregation plans and were rarely included as a viable group in segregation remedies. Results of the study were not intended for generalization. (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED190274

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to:
RC UD
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

VOLUME IV

SAMPLE III

TRENDS IN SEGREGATION OF HISPANIC STUDENTS IN MAJOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS HAVING LARGE HISPANIC ENROLLMENT

FINAL REPORT

November 30, 1979

Prepared by:

ASPIRA OF AMERICA, INC.

Project Director: Abdin Noboa

GRANT NUMBER: NIE-G-780226

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Abdin Noboa

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RC 011887

Volume IV: SAMPLE III

The intention of the Sample III analysis is to explore the shifting enrollment patterns using school-level data within twenty (20) districts. Analyses of enrollment statistics is both cross-sectional and longitudinal. Given this objective, a stratification plan was used to ensure that the selected districts would vary substantially on several characteristics. Additionally, the strategy drew upon statistical information about the total pool of eligible districts. While the intent was for the final set of districts to be maximally representative of all the districts, the final district selection was made in a purposive manner. For larger districts (e.g., Chicago), a sample of schools were chosen through systematic random sampling. (See Appendix A.)

District Sampling Methodology

The first step was to select a subset of states from which to sample districts. Altogether, 29 states had at least one district meeting the following criteria:

1. total enrollment of at least 3,000;
2. Hispanic enrollment of at least 5%; and
3. matched data for all years (1968, 1970, 1972, 1974, 1976)

Of these, ten states were selected. These states contained 86% of all the districts which met at least one of the criteria above and 97% of all Hispanic children in Sample 1 (as defined in Volume III). The ten states were grouped as follows:

Southwest	Other**
Arizona (AZ)	Connecticut (CT)
California (CA)	Florida (FL)
Colorado (CO)*	Illinois (IL)
New Mexico (NM)	New Jersey (NJ)
Texas (TX)	New York (NY)

Two additional criteria were used to determine eligibility of districts for inclusion in Sample III: each district had to have data at the school level, and each district had to have at least two elementary schools and two high schools.

The next step was to develop a stratification plan to ensure that the selected districts contained variability on certain characteristics. To this end, tabulations were made for all districts within the sampled states, including distributions of district size, indices of segregation, and percent of Hispanos. A 24-cell stratification plan was then developed (2 state groupings x 2 levels of % Hispanic x 3 levels of segregation x 2 levels of district size = 24 cells). The following cutoffs were used:

Percent Hispano:	High = ≥20% Low = <20%
Segregation Index, E(H,H,50%):	High = ≥.90 Med. = .01 - 89 Low = <.01
Number of schools:	Small = 1 - 15 Large = >15

All eligible districts were sorted into the above-described 24 cells with the following data listed for each district:

*For the purposes of this sample, Colorado was included as a Southwest state, this was not done for Sample I.
**With the exception of Illinois, these are primarily East Coast districts.

1. size--total enrollment, Hispanic enrollment, number of schools, number of high schools;

2. segregation indices--E(H,H,50%), E(H,B,50%), R(H,NH), D(H,NH), percentage changes in E(H,H,50%) from 1968 to 1976;

3. compliance status in 1976;

4. school practices--percent Hispano for the following: enrollment, professional staff, newly hired, special education, gifted, suspended or expelled, alternative education, dropouts, and bilingual education (or ESL); and

5. percent black.

At this point, districts were hand-picked to (a) maximize variability in the combinations of size, segregation (as defined by Coleman's R), and Percent Hispano, and (b) draw two districts from each state.

All school districts were selected, but for school districts where the total 1976 enrollment $\geq$ 15,000, a fraction of the schools were selected from these districts. In these cases the total district figure does not represent the district-wide total. The purpose of sampling was to reduce the number of schools for the school-level analysis. For the small districts all elementary and secondary schools were included (though not "other" schools). For the large districts, sampling fractions were established separately for elementary and secondary schools within each district. Once the sampling fractions for a district were determined, schools were arrayed from largest to smallest and ever Kth school sampled after randomly drawing the first school. (See Appendix A.)

The following table is a list of the school districts selected by their respective racial proportions and other data of interest:

TABLE 1

Sample III Districts (n = 20) by Percent Hispanic and Black Enrollment for 1972

District Name	State	Percentage Hispanic	Percentage Black	Total Enrollment
Palm Beach	FL	6	30	67,030
Rochester	NY	8	44	43,347
Atlantic City	NJ	9	67	8,831
Temple	TX	13	20	7,783
Chicago	IL	14	60	553,342
Collier	FL	15	8	10,748
Bryan	TX	16	27	9,134
Westminister	CO	16	1	17,149
Mapleton	CO	23	1	7,160
Santa Clara	CA	23	2	22,756
Aurora East	IL	25	15	9,975
Tucson	AZ	29	6	43,323
Duarte	CA	29	27	4,670
Stockton	CA	30	16	31,406
Bridgeport	CT	30	35	24,310
Hartford	CT	31	48	28,069
Yuma	AZ	35	4	6,741
Passaic	NJ	42	35	8,461
Santa Fe	NM	66	0	11,843
Gadsen	NM	84	4	4,272

Description of the Sample III Districts

The twenty districts in Sample III are a diverse group that appears to be representative (though not statistically) of the diversity in the main sample. We have classified these districts into two geographic groups, "Southwest" and "Other."

Analyses

Several types of analyses were conducted with Sample III:

(1) Analyze patterns of change in segregation indices from 1968 to 1976 for both Hispanos and blacks.

(2) Examine "R" and "S" indices of segregation to determine the extent of Hispanic segregation attributable to black and/or white mobility during the period 1968-76.

Segregation Patterns

In examining patterns of change (1968, '72, '76) using Coleman's R, the higher the R value in 1968, the greater the decrease in value in 1976 for both Hispanos and blacks. Not surprisingly, the greater change was from 1968 to 1972. However, when the R value is under .3, the change is not

always toward less segregation. At this level, R values are unpredictable for subsequent years.

In almost every school district, although black segregation was higher than that for Hispanos, black segregation decreased significantly more than for Hispanos for that period of time. In instances where the black and Hispanic level of segregation (as measured by R) were nearly the same (within .05 difference), black values for R again decreased more rapidly than for Hispanos.

In charting levels of segregation for each of the three years (1968, '72, '76) several patterns became noticeable. In nearly half of our districts the R values decreased in both 1972 and 1976. However, for many districts segregation levels of Hispanos again increased. By the year 1976, or in both 1972 and 1976, the overall trend for districts in Sample III show a rather limited decline in segregation (R = .03) within this eight year span.

Tri-ethnic Districts

Sample III provides a closer examination of segregation trends within a tri-ethnic community setting. Since R(H,NH) approximates R(H,W) + R(H,B), when there are no other minorities in the district, a breakdown of these indices yields Hispanic segregation trends vis-a-vis blacks and whites. Since R is a normalized form of S, S is a useful measure of the percent of a given racial group in school with the average Hispanic student. This allows a more direct measure of intradistrict flight. Using both measures, we can more easily analyze Hispanic trends in relation to black and white populations. (See Tables 2 and 3.)

While there is no one single summary for our findings, interesting trends are evident in the following tables as we compare Hispanic segregation to that of blacks. The discussion which follows refers to existing patterns

within selected districts, and is not intended to make generalizations to any larger set of districts.

The Atlantic City and Temple school districts provide a good example of districts where Hispanic segregation from whites is increasing. However, a closer examination indicates that these trends, although generally similar, are occurring for different reasons. In Temple, Hispanos are desegregating with blacks but not with whites. In Atlantic City, on the other hand, Hispanos are not desegregating with anyone, but continue to be further segregated from both blacks and whites (the desegregation plan represents a voluntary plan). Both of these districts are poor examples of successful tri-ethnic segregation. In Atlantic City, other evidence indicates that blacks are desegregating. This is not the case for Hispanos according to Tables 2 and 3, and it seems that the former may be directly related to the latter. We were not able to bear this out further for the Sample I districts.

TABLE 2
Desegregation Indices for All Schools (1968, '72, '76)*

District Name	R(H,NH)			R(H,W)			R(H,B)		
	1968	1972	1976	1968	1972	1976	1968	1972	1976
Palm Beach	.12	.06	.05	.00	.15	.11	.40	-.07	-.03
Rochester	.49	.10	.13	.54	.18	.26	.47	-.00	-.00
Atlantic City	.11	.25	.30	.13	.24	.31	.10	.26	.30
Temple	.13	.08	.05	.06	.22	.14	.33	-.10	-.06
Chicago	.72	.43	.50	.65	-.06	-.04	.66	.76	.78
Collier	.15	.17	.22	.30	.32	.34	-.11	-.10	-.08
Bryan	.33	.07	.04	.21	.10	.06	.60	-.00	-.00
Westminster	.10	.06	.05	.11	.06	.05	-.00	-.00	-.00
Mapleton	.01	.02	.02	.01	.02	.01	-.00	-.00	-.00
Santa Clara	.08	.09	.04	.08	.09	.04	.10	.12	-.00
Aurora East	.05	.08	.09	.12	.15	.14	-.05	-.05	-.01
Tucson	.41	.39	.34	.51	.49	.42	-.03	-.02	-.02
Duarte	.06	.02	.05	.10	.00	.03	-.02	.06	.08
Stockton	.11	.10	.07	.28	.22	.16	-.09	-.07	-.03
Bridgeport	.15	.18	.17	.33	.31	.27	-.07	.01	.07
Hartford	.22	.19	.24	.41	.14	.03	.03	.22	.34
Yuma	.10	.10	.12	.14	.14	.15	-.02	-.02	-.01
Passaic	.12	.10	.09	.37	.27	.23	-.12	-.04	-.01
Santa Fe	.06	.08	.08	.07	.08	.09	-.00	-.00	-.00
Gadsen	.03	.04	.04	.03	.04	.04	.00	.03	.01

*Indices are rounded to two decimal points.

TABLE 3

S Indices for All Schools (1968, '72, '76)*

District Name	S(H,NH)			S(H,B)		
	1968	1972	1976	1968	1972	1976
Palm Beach	.86	.90	.90	.17	.34	.28
Rochester	.49	.40	.80	.15	.38	.44
Atlantic City	.87	.70	.63	.56	.02	.47
Temple	.77	.80	.82	.15	.29	.25
Chicago	.26	.51	.48	.18	.10	.13
Collier	.78	.73	.75	.22	.19	.16
Bryan	.59	.84	.80	.11	.27	.27
Westminster	.82	.82	.80	.00	.00	.31
Mapleton	.86	.82	.76	.02	.01	.01
Santa Clara	.78	.77	.74	.00	.01	.02
Aurora East	.85	.91	.68	.15	.17	.15
Tucson	.44	.44	.47	.08	.07	.07
Duarte	.82	.80	.67	.22	.24	.25
Stockton	.71	.68	.66	.22	.21	.19
Bridgeport	.71	.65	.58	.37	.34	.32
Hartford	.67	.64	.53	.43	.39	.32
Yuma	.95	.63	.57	.07	.07	.05
Passaic	.69	.62	.54	.39	.35	.34
Santa Fe	.36	.33	.31	.00	.00	.00
Gadsen	.17	.13	.15	.01	.00	.00

It is interesting to note, however, that the overall segregation of Hispanos to all others has remained nearly the same. Palm Beach shows substantial desegregation between Hispanos and blacks but not between Hispanos and whites (similar to Temple). In contrast, Chicago shows decreasing segregation of Hispanos to whites with a slight overall increase of Hispano to black segregation. Hartford also shows rising segregation between Hispanos and blacks, but a dramatic drop in segregation between Hispanos and whites.

Bryan school district indicates excellent tri-ethnic desegregation for Hispanos as compared to blacks and to whites. It is interesting to note that this was the result of a court-ordered plan. Rochester also shows a fairly good desegregation trend.

In brief, the trend analyses for this sample shows multiple patterns of Hispanic segregation, many times hidden when only examining R(H,NH). Desegregation at the district level is sometimes achieved through further segregation of racial groups within the district, while at other times it is simply a result of white flight. For Hispanos, there is no overall pattern which can describe what occurs within the district. From these tables it is obvious that Hispanos are differentially affected by desegregation plans and that no widespread effort seems evident to counteract these trends. Moreover, they have not been included as a viable group in many of the remedies. However, this type analysis was not done for Sample I school districts, and the conclusions are not generalizable.

APPENDIX A

Sample III Districts by OE Code, Number of Schools and Sampling Fraction

OE CODE	District Name	Number of Schools			Sampling Fraction for selecting schools
		Secondary	Elementary	All Public schools	
1901500	Palm Beach, FL	17	46	63	1/3 1/3
4224750	Rochester, NY	9	30	39	1/3 1/3
4000960	Atlantic City, NJ	3	9	12	1
5342330	Temple, TX	3	12	15	1
2309930	Chicago, IL	28	348	376	1/10 1/10
1900330	Collier, FL	5	7	121	1
5311790	Bryan, TX	2	9	11	1
1507230	Westminster, CO	6	13	21	1
1505550	Mapleton, CO	4	7	11	1
1435430	Santa Clara, CA	8	10	18	1
2304680	Aurora East, IL	3	9	14	1
1208760	Tucson, AZ	11	53	64	1/3 1/3
1411520	Duarte, CA	2	4	6	1
1438010	Stockton, CA	8	27	35	1/2 1/2
1600450	Bridgeport, CT	3	27	30	1 1/3
1601920	Hartford, CT	2	21	23	1 1/2
1209600	Yuma, AZ	2	10	12	1
4012540	Passaic, NJ	2	8	10	1
4102370	Santa Fe, NM	6	10	16	1
4101080	Gadsen, NM	2	6	8	1